

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of this Amendment, which amends claims 21-24, claims 21-24 remain pending. In the Office Action, claims 22 and 23 were objected to because of informalities; claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as the invention; and claims 21-24 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,751,507, hereinafter “Hama”) in view of IBM technical disclosure bulletin and in view of Mederer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,782, hereinafter “Mederer”). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments above and remarks below.

Claim Objections

Applicants have amended claims 22 and 23 to depend off claim 21 and thus respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Section 112 rejections

Claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as the invention. As discussed during the interview, applicants have amended claim 21 to include a first set of nodes in a plurality of nodes that are displayed in a section of the display screen, wherein a portion of the image is displayed in the section of the display screen. Further, the navigator box provides a miniature representation of a second set of nodes in the plurality of nodes. Also, the first set of nodes and the second set of nodes display the plurality of nodes in the navigator box and the inner box. Applicants submit that claim 21, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of §112. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections. Claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 21, thus the withdrawal of the rejections of these claims is requested.

Section 103 rejections

Applicants submit that Hama, IBM technical disclosure bulletin, and Mederer, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest every element of claim 21. For example, these references do not disclose or suggest omitting display of the lines interconnecting the plurality of nodes in the photograph displayed within the inner box and the navigator box while lines interconnecting the first set of nodes are displayed in the section of the display screen. As shown in Hama, Fig. 5, a part of an evergreen tree is shown in magnification in a display screen 23. A full screen picture that includes all screen images from display screen 23 shown in display screen 22. Further, in Mederer, Fig. 1, dots are shown in boxes 24 and 26 without lines. In Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, lines are shown interconnecting the dots.

Applicants submit that Hama, Mederer, and the IBM technical disclosure, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest omitting the display of lines in the inner box and navigator box while lines interconnecting the first set of nodes are displayed in the section of the display screen. In all references, either no lines are shown or lines are shown. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21. Claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 21 and thus derive patentability at least therefrom.


Applicants also submit that claim 24 should be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed with respect to claim 21.

Appl. No. 09/930,115
Client Ref. 50P4410.01
Docket No. 020699-004800US

Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly sought. The undersigned may be contacted at the telephone number below at the Examiner's convenience if it would help in the prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

TRELLIS INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PC

By 

Brian N. Young
Reg. No. 48,602
Tel.: 650-842-0300